

320  
EUIS#

**EXTERNAL EVALUATION OF THE CONSORTIUM FOR THE  
SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ANDEAN ECOREGION  
(CONDESAN)**

Lima, Peru, June 1996

**DR. NICOLAS MATEO  
Dr. KENNETH BROWN  
Mr. EDWARD WEBER**

This evaluation was carried out between May 20 and June 12, 1996, at the request of the CONDESAN Board of Directors and was administered by IDRC, Canada.

## CONTENTS

### Executive Summary and Recommendations

1. Background
2. Philosophy and Strategy
3. Mission and Objectives
4. Research and Development Results
5. Membership and Roles of Partners
  - Membership characteristics and responsibilities
  - Leadership and transparency
  - Collaboration
  - Building relationships
  - Commitment
  - Image projection
  - Planning and monitoring
  - Fund raising
  - Donor collaboration
6. Planning and Implementation Processes
  - The planning process
  - Areas of research
  - "Mesas de Concertación"
  - Infoandina
  - Benchmark sites
  - Competitive grants
  - Modelling
7. Consortium Structure and Resource Management
8. Looking to the Future

APPENDIX I: Itinerary of the Evaluation Team

APPENDIX II: People Met and Meeting Participants

APPENDIX III: Figures

Figure 1. Linkages Between CONDESAN Associates

Figure 2. Proposed Structure and Relationships

APPENDIX IV: Acronyms

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **Executive summary**

The external component of the evaluation of the Consorcio Sostenible de la Ecoregion Andina (CONDESAN) was carried out between May 20 and June 12, 1996, and included discussions with Consortium members, visits to the benchmark sites in Ecuador, Peru and Bolivia and interactions with personnel from CIP, IDRC and COSUDE.

CONDESAN mechanisms and strategies are very promising and can impact positively in the Andean ecoregion through development focused research. The capacity of CONDESAN to join efforts and resources among diverse members, utilize accumulated scientific and technical knowledge and promote the definition of priorities by consensus are important strengths.

The evaluation team encountered evidence of good quality research in various sectors of the Consortium. Among these should be mentioned: the ex-ante evaluation work (modelling) by members of CIP and CONDESAN which is beginning to provide a framework for research focus and for testing results; the further development and continuing use of knowledge, methodologies and technologies supported by IDRC and CIDA of Canada in the Peruvian altiplano; and, the identification, characterization and conservation of Andean Roots and Tubers under the RTA project initiative supported by the Swiss (SDC). In addition to this major funding from IDRC and SDC, the Team was pleased to note support from various other donors, particularly that of the governments of Germany, Austria, Denmark, Spain, the Netherlands, the Interamerican Development Bank and ILEIA. More important still is the fact that a substantial number of NGOs are beginning to associate and complement their development work in the field with CONDESAN research interests.

The evaluators noted the importance of CIP's role as convenor for CONDESAN and the associates' desire that CIP continue to play a significant role in scientific and administrative support as well as in the search for consortium funding at the international level.

Given the evident local support base from municipalities and NGOs for the research and development activities in the pilot sites, CONDESAN can hope for a high level of sustainability in its future activities. However, the external scientific and financial incentives which CONDESAN can attract and bring are essential to accelerate the process and achieve multiplication effects.

In the course of its visits to pilot sites and in interviews with many participants, the attention of the team was drawn to some deficiencies or weaknesses. The principal ones are noted in the following paragraphs with the objective of contributing to improvements in the Consortium.

It was evident that a certain transparency was lacking in the relationship structure between CIP and other associates as well as in the reporting of financial resources under the CONDESAN umbrella. The evaluation team had difficulty in separating funds attributed to

CONDESAN from those of related CIP activities such as the Management of Andean Natural Resources Program, the Global Mountain Initiative and the Mountain Forum. Further, various associates indicated their desire for greater clarity with respect to available funds and to co-participate in the decision-making with respect to their use. The utilization of resources in the RTA biodiversity initiative is much more transparent and predictable given that funding comes from one source and deals with a more limited set of activities.

The identity, mission, objectives and structure of CONDESAN lack adequate clarity and consistency in their definition and presentation. This situation is not surprising given that CONDESAN is a recent evolving initiative formed on the basis of various earlier programs and disperse experiences for which CONDESAN now serves as a linkage and integrating mechanism. As a contribution to resolving this limitation, some suggestions are included in the recommendations section.

Adjustment in the location of CONDESAN personnel is suggested in order to achieve greater effectiveness and a better distribution of resources to the benchmark sites. The evaluators noted the positive role of CONDESAN Coordination in projecting an external image of the Consortium and in attracting additional resources, however, some concern was felt with an apparent lack of program focus. This was evident from a weak dedication to forming a true working team, achieving a common vision and goals and promoting the internal and external exchange of information.

Nevertheless, CONDESAN is well established and should continue. Its concepts and mechanisms are solid and are quickly evolving with the experience of experimentation. At this point in its development, the consortium needs a strong and versatile convening partner and for this role, CIP is the natural choice. It has a major challenge to lead without overly dominating the other members and to experiment with new ways for managing non-line responsibility relationships. The evaluators feel that the weaknesses pointed out in this report, and the recommendations, can over time be turned into strengths and opportunities to be added to the considerable accomplishments already realized by the CONDESAN partners.

## Recommendations

- a) CONDESAN needs a clearer mission statement which will allow it to project a common vision and purpose to its partners. In the same way, better defined objectives would assist in guiding and promoting Consortium activities.
- b) Given that CONDESAN is a unique and novel experience in research and development, the transparency, creativity and leadership of each node and member needs to be emphasized as the base for a strong Consortium able to effect positive changes. This recommendation refers especially to CIP which needs to seek transparency in the management of resources and to actively collaborate in the definition of the roles and responsibilities of CONDESAN partnerships.
- c) CONDESAN should consider adjusting its research and development focus towards the demand for (and not just the offer of) technology. Market incentives and opportunities (identified or created) should be used as a guide so that CONDESAN research is more selective and specific. This vision corresponds directly with the proposed mission statement to contribute to the alleviation of poverty and improve the wellbeing of the population of the Andean ecoregion.
- d) CONDESAN should be an independent initiative but with strong scientific linkages and mutual support with CIP. This concept is illustrated by two diagrams (Appendix III) in which CIP is shown as a very important partner but not the hub of the Consortium. The proposed structure strengthens all partners and improves the sense of ownership of all members.
- e) Because the credibility of CONDESAN rests on the quality and effectiveness of its results, encouraging good planning and monitoring practices should be considered an important strategy for each member.
- f) It is essential to better define the benchmark site concept, particularly the selection criteria, representativeness and the relationships to affinity sites. The evaluation team feels that more resources could be invested in the benchmark sites and that responsibilities and budget management should be more decentralized.
- g) Priority should be given to the resolution of identified problems and opportunities in the benchmark sites when allocating Research Competition funds. The participation of associates in the analysis and decisions regarding these funds should be encouraged.
- h) Within the proposed structure, INFOANDINA must play an essential role and be endowed with adequate resources to respond to opportunities and demands. There is a very great need and opportunity to compile, produce and exchange information as well as to stimulate electronic conferences on related themes. Also of significant importance

is the need to continue promoting awareness of CONDESAN and to document and disseminate information on the CONDESAN experience.

- i) Less concentration of personnel in Lima is desirable as CONDESAN capacity, knowledge and resources could be situated at any of the nodes. The present concentration in one location is not indispensable, particularly if INFOANDINA can realize its mission of linkage and communication between partners.
- j) Staff located in Lima should include the coordinator, the INFOANDINA manager and a specialist in marketing and value-added processes. The latter would be responsible for working with the private sector at local, national (for example ADEX in Peru) and international levels to identify and generate market opportunities and thereby better guide and focus the research process.
- k) Each of the CONDESAN partners should have the prerogative and stimulus to identify and obtain funding for the objectives and mission of the Consortium. In fact, this characteristic is a CONDESAN strength for augmenting its platform of support and the sustainability of its activities. The conditions under which members can utilize the CONDESAN name to obtain funding need to be discussed and clarified.
- l) The principal donor partners can play a key role in facilitating the search for resources and in promoting the image and potential of CONDESAN as an effective medium for integrating and channelling external R&D support. A solid core of donor providing operational funds is important for the medium to long term evolution and stability of CONDESAN. These funds are especially important in elements such as INFOANDINA, model elaboration and ex-ante analysis, coordination responsibilities and the creation of a solid fund for supporting competitive research proposals.
- m) CONDESAN should continue motivating and providing incentives for the democratic processes involved in "Mesa de Concertación" experiences. Potentially, this is one of the greatest strengths of the Consortium.
- n) CONDESAN Coordination needs to improve its capacity and initiative in the areas of synthesis and conceptual interaction, team work and the development of a joint vision.

## 1. BACKGROUND

The origin of the Consortium for Sustainable Development of the Andean Eco-region (CONDESAN) goes back to 1992 when the International Potato Center (CIP) with intellectual and financial support of the International Development Research Centre of Canada (IDRC) organized and promoted this initiative with the participation of partners from Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador and Peru. Subsequently, conceptual and financial support from other governments, as well as that of many regional and local partners made possible the expansion and implementation of CONDESAN activities in benchmark sites in the Andean eco-region. In parallel, the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) provided support for the biodiversity program, especially the collection and conservation of Andean Roots and Tubers, and as a consequence this project was included as an integral part of CONDESAN.

Towards the end of 1995, the CONDESAN Board of Directors and the principal donors indicated their interest in undertaking an internal and external evaluation of the Consortium. The principal purpose of the evaluation was to identify and analyse results obtained, the manner in which partners in the Consortium are integrated and to propose any necessary adjustments.

The following steps were adopted for the evaluation. A survey of CONDESAN partners and other organizations interested in the initiative was designed and administered by an IDRC consultant and a total of 42 responses were received. The quality of the information provided varied considerably and in general was quite subjective. The responses were not subjected to a quantitative analysis but the evaluators took note of the replies in the context of carrying out the general evaluation. An internal evaluation was then undertaken in the form of written reports by the CONDESAN activity leaders. Unfortunately, these documents, with a few exceptions, did not demonstrate a true synthesis but rather a collection of detailed and descriptive information. In any case, the documentation served as useful reference material to help understand the complexity of the interactions and activities of CONDESAN.

The final step was the external evaluation summarized in this document and which reflects the viewpoints and the recommendations of the evaluation team composed of: Nicolas Mateo (Costa Rica), Kenneth Brown (United Kingdom) and Edward Weber (Canada). This evaluation committee visited various fieldwork sites and met with member representatives between May 20th and June 12th, 1996. The team itinerary and people met are presented in Appendices I and II respectively. The principal recommendations are included in the first section of this report.

The evaluation group wishes to thank the farmers, the partners and personnel of CONDESAN as well as those of CIP who willingly and openly agreed to share with us their ideas and expectations. Special appreciation is due to Dr. Hubert Zandstra, Director General of CIP, Dr. Jose Luis Rueda and Elias Mujica of CONDESAN, other members of the technical committee and to Dr. Hugo Li Pun of IDRC for their willing assistance. Finally, we would

like to express our gratitude to Olga Mould and Emma Martinez for their efficient secretarial and translation assistance in the preparation of this document.

## **2. PHILOSOPHY AND STRATEGY**

CONDESAN has been conceptualized in a unique way when compared to existing research and development programs. At the same time, it is solidly constructed on the foundation of prior work in the Andean region. It is easy to talk about an holistic approach but much more difficult to put it into practice. Much past experience and methodology revolves around breaking issues and problems down into component parts for analysis rather than putting them together in operational terms relevant to the lives and aspirations of people. More recently this reductionist approach has been challenged, systems research methodology has been introduced and many more interrelationships have been considered. The Consortium idea represents the next step in this progression of R&D methods related to the utilization and management of the renewable natural resource base. It has been evolving from disciplinary and commodity focused initiatives to crop or animal production systems and then to total farming systems with some participatory, market and socioeconomic approaches included. The CONDESAN experiment seeks to go one step further with greater integration of institutional, technical and policy aspects linked at several levels and with a strong focus on democratic, participatory processes.

A consortium is a partnership, union or association of institutions put together to achieve objectives requiring large resources and which no one or two institutions could accomplish on their own. The concept is to combine relevant resources, efforts, experience and knowledge for wider, more complete and focused coverage. The combined knowledge is often worth more than the sum of its individual parts reflecting the experience that two or more people or institutions in conversation, listening and sharing, can create something, conceive ideas, that each alone could not.

CONDESAN is a leap into a new world of interrelating and sharing for the purpose of discovering greater complementarity of efforts and more efficient use of human and financial resources. The background to the initiative was one of tight finances and an attempt to build on existing efforts and achievements although that was not all. The need to find ways of dealing with the pervasive problems of natural resource degradation on one side, and continuing widespread poverty on the other, called for an ecoregion-wide approach to dealing with the underlying factors on a grand scale with a long-term vision. Operationalizing the concept was begun with participatory planning (PPO), a holistic point of view, interdisciplinary perspectives, an orientation toward focus and excellence in research, closer linking of research and development programs and a broadened range of institutional collaborators. This amplified set of contacts provided access to a greater number of potential partners with their particular experiences and knowledge sets. In terms of content, coverage includes biological sciences, social sciences, socioeconomic and community development



methods, information and communication programs, policy and civic administration experiments, market research and raw material transformation. Donor agencies are important partners and are encouraged to collaborate more closely in their planning and support. A major challenge remains in how to bridge the gap in understanding between these many points of view and content elements and at the same time find creative, synergistic ways of sharing resources available to each.

Because of the wide range of interests, abilities and roles represented in the membership of CONDESAN, traditional ways of categorizing partner relationships and their roles are not entirely adequate. Discontinuities exist in the spheres of interest of each at the same time as areas of overlapping interests occur. In some spheres, competition for resources, recognition and leadership naturally surface and the inclination is to define and expand boundaries within which a particular group or interest can take ownership and assert hegemony. These boundaries tend to block out opportunities for mutually productive interaction and exchange to the extent that even in relatively small areas, activities are duplicated, resources are wasted and achievements less than what is potentially possible. In opposition to this competitive model, new opportunities are being discovered in the context of "spaces" of shared initiatives and objectives. CONDESAN partners are creating these spaces where consultation and mutually supporting interactive collaboration is taking place.

The roles of CONDESAN partners then are defined by their purpose, objectives and spheres of action in a very complex array of intermingled interests. To sort this out in a logical and productive way requires a different way of conceptualizing the space within which this multitude of interactions can blend and of activating the processes required to make this blending possible. A potentially useful perspective is to view the interests of each partner as having a core focus from which its reach radiates and mingles with that of others rather than from the view of contained areas and protected boundaries.

### **3. MISSION AND OBJECTIVES**

Given the wide variety of member interests under the CONDESAN umbrella, it is important to have a clear mission and vision at all levels of the Consortium, especially at the benchmark sites where there is substantial participation of local producers and municipal authorities.

During the review of the CONDESAN documentation, analysis of the researcher presentations and discussions with partner representatives, the evaluators found diverse presentations of purpose, concept and objectives. Most likely owing to the evolutionary development of CONDESAN, no consistent statement of mission and objectives was encountered. The evaluation team did receive a clear impression that the alleviation of poverty in the region is a general concern but the linkages between this preoccupation, the sustainable management of natural resources and the objectives of research activities did not appear to be clearly established. Research per se should not be the overall priority but rather the tool

which permits reaching the purposes, principles and objectives of the Consortium. Well-focused and firm guidelines are required to guarantee the productive and relevant use of available efforts and resources.

The mission statement of the Consortium should be brief and clear, complemented by specific objectives which respond to concrete member situations and actions. In this way, there is a clear guide to orient the research and development work undertaken.

For the purpose of stimulating discussion among partners as well as in the Board of Directors of the Consortium, the evaluation team proposes the following text for consideration:

### **Mission statement**

CONDESAN seeks to optimize the utilization and conservation of Andean natural resources and contribute to poverty alleviation through the integration of research and development actions.

### **Objectives**

1. To promote and conduct research and sustainable development actions in: the use of land and water resources; crop, animal and pasture biodiversity; agricultural policies; and, improved production to consumption systems.
2. To organize and promote human resource training with emphasis on continuous group learning mechanisms.
3. To develop information, communication and diffusion systems and mechanisms which will promote and facilitate the exchange of ideas, knowledge and experiences between all members.
4. To stimulate changes in local and national policies and legislation, especially through participatory and consultative processes which lead to reducing poverty and to optimal use of productive resources.

Other useful concepts which the Board and partners should continue to emphasize in focusing and projecting the CONDESAN image are the following:

The Consortium is guided by the principles of sharing strengths, knowledge, costs and benefits for the good of the ecoregion and its inhabitants.

The Consortium is governed by principles of decentralization, delegation of authority and responsibility to the lowest operating level possible, and by the efficient horizontal transfer of information and knowledge.

#### 4. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT RESULTS

CONDESAN encourages parallel research and development initiatives. It is difficult to separate the achievements of CONDESAN itself from those already in progress before the Consortium was conceived. With the evolution of CONDESAN, additional experience has been integrated with already existing experience. An important point in the evaluation was to determine how the different actors work together and how they combine their resources and perceive the CONDESAN concept.

Research and development synthesis is found at several levels. At the level of the farmer or producer, attention is drawn to those involved with the in-situ conservation of Andean roots and tubers (RTA) and those who maintain the records in the runoff and erosion measurement plots. In the benchmark sites, the municipal authorities and NGOs are closely involved in the planning of conservation activities in their watersheds. At the scientific level, there is cohesion between different disciplines and ex-ante analysis of proposed innovations is carried out to avoid conflictive situations which might arise for lack of understanding of social and economic factors.

The evaluation highlighted the integrated research focus on sustainable agriculture which is being carried out in the El Angel river watershed in Carchi and in the micro-watershed of La Encañada, Cajamarca. The combination of social scientist, natural scientist, municipalities, NGOs and farmer associations has created an important consensus focus. Results of a previous study on the possible risks of excessive insecticide use on subterranean water and human health has been incorporated into the general planning for the El Angel watershed.

One of the NGOs which had only been involved in development activities in Cajamarca suggested publicly that all partners should contribute ten percent of future project financing to form a research fund for the area. This indicates how the close integration of research and development is creating an awareness of the benefits which can be derived from such association.

Although not constituting research in the strictest sense, the organization of annual seed fairs in Cajamarca is a valuable tool not only for promoting the exchange of plant varieties and demonstrating the wide variety of all crops available, but also to check on genetic erosion. It should be noted that this activity preceded CONDESAN and that one of its present key associates, ASPADERUC, was the principal leader.

The altiplano areas of Bolivia and Peru have benefitted substantially from the previous IDRC and other project support. The present studies which combine the resources of various members are adapting practical measures to resolve the problems of the altiplano. Areas of high risk for salinisation have been identified using a combination of satellite imagery and field observations and the utilization of halophytic plants is progressing in the provision of forage

for sheep while reducing salinity. Combining the imaging technology with analysis of fifty years of meteorological data, it is possible to identify those areas with high frost and drought risk. Various practical measures for increasing incomes have been introduced in the community of Orkopiña where farm plots are very small. These measures include the introduction of rustic greenhouses, drip irrigation and the collection and storage of runoff water which allow production of vegetables and fruits with a good market in La Paz. The same practices are found across the border in Peru. It has been calculated that, including amortization of capital costs over five years, the average income of participants has been raised by 25 percent and their standard of living has notably improved.

In Peru and Ecuador research on the utilization of land and water resources is closely integrated with the understanding and conservation of watersheds. Models of existing systems and potential improvements are quite advanced in Ecuador and were developed by a scientist who formerly worked on the PISA project in Puno. This individual is about to leave for PhD studies and will leave a gap in the scientific team. The evaluation team suggests that CONDESAN examines how this vacancy can be filled in the near future.

Greater food security and a diminished level of poverty for producers in Puno is an ambitious goal but one which should be maintained in the Consortium's strategy. The aim is to include transformation (value-added) and markets as essential elements in the approach. Past and current research carried out by PISA, PRODASA and now CIRNMA-CONDESAN have a solid scientific and technical base but need to concentrate selectively on identified opportunities for market modification, maintaining a conservation framework and rational use of productive resources. Various commodities have potential for the future, in particular the Andean grains quinoa and kañiwa, products of animal origin such as fibre, meat and hides, and the Andean tubers oca and ulluco. The PELT project, Special Binational Project for Lake Titicaca, through its research and agricultural and hydro-biological processing unit, has developed some interesting products, at pilot scale, including canned meats, cured, smoked and dehydrated products as well as breads and biscuits. These experiences and knowledge should be tested in regional, national and international markets in close collaboration with the private (for example ADEX, Peruvian Exporters Association) and state sectors.

The evaluation team found that the collection and conservation of Andean roots and tubers are well documented in the three countries where the project is active. In Ecuador, it is difficult to have a practical impact in the Carchi area because of a sparse indigenous population and hence little cultivation of Andean roots and tubers. However, in the process of germplasm collection in the area, several varieties of ulluco were discovered with a low mucilage content, a characteristic especially valued in the market. Consumer acceptability was evaluated through organoleptic and culinary studies.

The RTA program, although a part of CONDESAN, is concentrated in micro-centres of biodiversity and is the subject of a separate evaluation. The majority of RTA activities do not coincide with other CONDESAN initiatives located at benchmark sites which were chosen

to be representative of specific agro-ecological zones.

Market potential is a factor to consider with these crops. Unless other studies bring new ideas, it was suggested to the team that amongst the RTA, only ulluco production does not satisfy current market demand. This question was raised of what investment level is justified for the other RTAs if the mission of CONDESAN is to raise the economic level of the indigenous population. This leaves aside, of course, the difficult question of putting a value on biodiversity conservation. For the most part, potato is more advantageous from a family consumption perspective although its production at a regional level has diminished considerably. Maca represents a special case of a niche market developed by a private sector firm but the production level needed to fulfil market requirements is relatively small.

The RTA work in the Puno region is concentrated around Lake Titicaca in the Yunguyo area. Initially a survey was carried out to assess the genetic variability and limiting factors in production of oca, ulluco and isaño. The Bolivian altiplano is an area rich in germplasm and has been well-documented with respect to potatoes and other RTAs.

Up to the present, the RTA work has not promoted utilization of the variety of identified germplasm except in Puno where production and marketing studies of RTAs were done over the past year and improved production methods will be tested with 100 farmers each cultivating approximately 350 square metres. This region also shows good integration and complementarity of RTA activities with those of other CONDESAN associates. In the future, there needs to be greater complementarity of demand studies and the potential for raw material transformation. It was proposed as well that this aspect receive more attention in Bolivia.

The gender equality theme is considered in models developed in Ecuador to differentiate the roles of different family members. One of the NGOs in Cajamarca also showed interest in this topic because women play a critical role in the use and conservation of Andean crops. Other participants in the discussion, however, did not take the topic seriously. A high degree of interest in this theme was observed in Puno.

The evaluation team noted ample opportunity for providing training at all levels. This is being done partially at the farm level, mostly by the technical assistants of various NGOs. At the technical personnel level, some efforts are being made to provide training in more advanced methodologies. In Cajamarca, ADEFOR, the Forestry Research and Development Association, has excellent training facilities and is eager to organize international courses in agroforestry for CONDESAN members. Undoubtedly, other institutions can provide the same services. It was also of interest to note that several students were doing their Masters degree theses in related projects under the supervision of CONDESAN scientists.

During its visits, the team was pleased to note the research quality being realized by many of the partners, however, most of the NGOs are principally involved in development projects.

A positive step is that the NGOs are becoming conscious of the benefits which can be derived from combining resources with research oriented organizations.

## **5. MEMBERSHIP AND ROLES OF PARTNERS**

### **Membership characteristics and responsibilities**

CONDESAN is an association of equal members or partners. Participation is open, often informal, and built on the idea of sharing resources and knowledge within defined spaces of competence, comparative advantage and available resources. The roles of the various partners are diverse and defined by their specific interests, associations, responsibilities and commitments. This diversity can represent both a strength and a weakness but in general the association of all these interests in voluntary collaboration and good faith provides opportunities not realized in most networks of a more structured and contrived nature. Each partner comes with its own set of self interests as well as its potential contributions and finds under the CONDESAN umbrella a place to both receive and to contribute in the measure of its capabilities and resources.

The 1993 PPO initiative defined membership very loosely in the following way, "The Consortium will be open to all those interested in joining. These may be bilateral research and development projects, universities, or national, regional, international and private institutions. The sharing of responsibilities, costs and benefits will be sought. Other networks which study one or more of the components of the Andean agro-ecosystem may affiliate with the Consortium." It was foreseen that certain networks or institutions would take leading roles in areas of specialization related to the four main sector and theme topics of CONDESAN. At the same time, it was recognized that all partners in the Consortium should have equal status with respect to planning, implementation and execution of the various project related activities. They may come from any level in the R&D spectrum and each should contribute from its own strength in terms of knowledge and financial and human resources in different sectors or themes. Donors may also be members in CONDESAN with the prospect of combining resources and expertise within the overall planning context. This potential interaction can provide for greater melding of research support outputs and development action programme support.

A number of characteristics define the qualities members need to develop in order to assume the different roles required to integrate the many actions and interconnections implied. Some of these are transparency, collaborative attitudes, relationship building, commitment to shared objectives and democratic processes.

### **Leadership and transparency**

If the CONDESAN concept is to function well, leadership at all levels must strive to promote and demonstrate openness in interaction and exchange of information. The structure of the Consortium is built around voluntary association to a great extent and therefore can only thrive in an environment of mutual trust encouraged by transparency in all exchanges whether technical, organizational, financial or personal. This is especially true for the coordination group based at CIP. Leadership can be taken at any level by any partner and should be considered an element of active membership in CONDESAN.

### **Collaboration**

In some cases, members may join forces to prepare proposals for support or combine resources to avoid duplication, achieve greater coverage or provide more catalytic leadership. The potential of CONDESAN to achieve micro-regional level impact is an important element to attract both regional and international technical and financial resources. Collaboration in seeking such funding should be the responsibility of each member. Along with the generation of resources, partners in the Consortium have an obligation and opportunity to join in rationalizing the use of available resources. Members also have a unique opportunity at the local, regional and national levels to influence research and development policies which will favour micro-regions, communities and individual producers. Another important role of members, and of CONDESAN as an entity, is to train their personnel not just locally but also through learning in affinity groups across various Andean countries.

### **Building relationships**

CONDESAN Coordination and members at all levels share both the opportunity and the responsibility for building relationships. This theme is intertwined with those of transparency, good management and coordination. CIP can play a particularly useful role in this aspect given its convening authority, wide array of contacts, credibility and communication facilities. Good relationships are built on interaction and trust and these areas need to be carefully nurtured and promoted. It is the responsibility of Central Coordination to promote and encourage this kind of relationship building and to lead by example.

### **Commitment**

Membership in CONDESAN carries with it, as the principal motivation, a commitment to the ideals and perspective of the organization. Although accessing financial resources is an important role of CONDESAN Coordination, it should not be the main motivating attraction for membership. Rather, active participation should be a requirement within the context and scope of each institution's abilities to contribute and to attract its own financial support. No single participant or group should dominate unduly nor unjustifiably claim credit or ownership of the various outcomes of the work undertaken under the CONDESAN umbrella.

### **Image projection**

Building a solid and positive image for CONDESAN depends on much more than publicity and promotion although these are important. Internally, an image and

perception of openness and collaboration, of exchange and sharing, needs to be fully fostered by all members. While a start has been made in this direction, more effort could be put into internal coherence and promotion of the concept over a much wider band of interested parties. Of particular significance is the reaction of funding agencies. In a few cases, members have been effective in getting their proposals funded due to their association with CONDESAN. This is an area that could be reinforced to the advantage of members at all levels. Demonstrating that CONDESAN is able to effectively promote, facilitate and focus the results of research from many different fields in an applied way is an important task of all partners.

### **Planning and monitoring**

Planning and monitoring are essential aspects of all effective R&D and therefore need to be included as integral parts of partner initiatives. Not only do they provide a basis for better focused work, but they also lead to clearer accountability, an important element in maintaining productive relationships. Because the credibility of CONDESAN will rest on the quality and effectiveness of its results, good planning and monitoring practices should be considered an integral part of the role of each partner.

### **Fund raising**

The review team was impressed by the initiative taken by a number of partners to submit proposals and access funds from a variety of donors independently of the Co-ordination office but under the CONDESAN umbrella. In several cases these proposals were successful and the partners were advised that the association of their proposal with the CONDESAN integrating and holistic image was an important factor in the decision to support their proposal. This is an area which CONDESAN Co-ordination should cultivate carefully with a view to creating and spreading the image of CONDESAN as a reliable and effective association capable of catalytic and efficient application of resources in an R&D context.

Associated with the above, CIP and CONDESAN Co-ordination should encourage partners to seek funding from a wide range of donors with whom they may have special affinities and interests. In the case of weaker partners, it could be effective for Co-ordination to assist, where appropriate, in the conceptualization and preparation of proposals. This is part of the responsibility for creating strong partners and for sharing resources and results as appropriate. CIP plays a special role in this context at the international level with a focus on attracting support for high level quality research. It is useful to CIP and to other partners to have access to development funds which can be applied at the field level in an R&D context and have these activities linked to more sophisticated research and modeling efforts supported by or based at CIP.

It should be part of the responsibilities of all CONDESAN active partners to raise funds for their own activities whether locally or internationally. In this context, it would be useful for the Co-ordination unit to specify guidelines under which active and/or prospective partners could associate the CONDESAN name with their fund-raising initiatives.



### **Donor collaboration**

The task of integrating and coordinating the initiatives of Andean partners in their various contexts and roles would be greatly facilitated if donor agencies were able to respond in a more flexible way to proposals based on the needs and opportunities identified in the region. There is a key role for core donor partners to play in convening and facilitating joint support efforts and in promoting the image and potential of CONDESAN. For donors who direct the major part of their support to development programmes, the Consortium provides an opportunity to expand the potential reach and impact of their investment and to benefit from research and inputs of other members.

## **6. PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION PROCESSES**

CONDESAN has at its disposal a variety of planning and implementation mechanisms some of which are being effectively employed and others which have barely been considered. The most outstanding of these are discussed below.

### **The planning process**

The decision to initiate CONDESAN highlighted the need for a process to prioritize anticipated research activities. It was decided to use the PPO ( Participatory Planning by Objectives) process to deal with the wide spectrum of partners exhibiting very different interests and abilities. PPO seemed an appropriate method to ensure active participation and to create a sense of ownership in CONDESAN. The outcome was several "trees" of problems, possible solutions, activities and indicators for measuring results.

The PPO process is based on similar interaction, communication and participatory principles to those applied in the "Mesas de Concertación" described later but with a much greater focus on specifically defined sets of inputs, outputs, expected outcomes, indicators and basic assumptions. Five of these planning meetings have been organized in various locations under the CONDESAN umbrella. The process has been useful at a project level where the parameters of the proposed objectives and activities were more clearly definable. However, for medium and long-term planning the approach has not been applied to any noticeable extent. There is frequent reference to the PPO in the context of biodiversity activities and of main objectives at some of the benchmark sites.

Development of an effective planning, monitoring and evaluation process is an important ingredient for clearer CONDESAN definition of its roles and co-ordination. Whether the same intensity of the PPO process is required at all levels with its requirement for a skilled

moderator should be evaluated. Certainly CONDESAN needs to promote a functional planning process with its partners.

The strengths of the PPO process include:

- a) the provision of a planning forum in which all partners are equal in a democratic process. This should in theory create a sense of ownership and commitment to CONDESAN by those partners involved;
- b) the facilitation of an innovative synergistic approach by bringing together several scientific disciplines, experiences in development activities, administrative involvement and farmers' accumulated experience in a specific environment; and,
- c) the provision of opportunities for integration of knowledge gained from past projects and from the results currently being generated. It brings a wide range of experience from both scientific and practical perspectives to bear on the identification of problems and potential solutions.

### **Areas of research**

The main areas of research identified for CONDESAN focus are grouped in four categories as follows:

- I. Biodiversity of Andean Crops, Pastures and Animals
- II. Land and water Management/Agroforestry
- III. Agrarian Policy and Rural Development
- IV. Production Systems

Most of the research activities described in the reports studied by the CE relate to the first two categories with some work in category III linked principally to the "Mesas de Concertación". The fourth category was mentioned very little and in fact varied in description from earlier documentation on the Consortium. It appears that initially it was intended to relate to the market and postharvest aspects of the production to consumption chain but little emphasis has been given to this aspect in activities reported although systems approach is being followed.

The work in biodiversity is concentrated mostly on the Andean root and tuber crop conservation and characterization initiatives supported by the Swiss. This work operates almost independently of the other CONDESAN themes which are more focused on sustainable land and water management and improved livelihoods for Andean people. A strong component of the land and water management category is linked to modelling of sub-systems of the production base. The modelling of some socioeconomic subsystems could be included in category IV but this was not explicitly indicated to the evaluation team by the CONDESAN coordinators or in the reports. Reporting revolved much more around specific activities at benchmark sites, modelling and policy issues.

The CE feels that many of the best opportunities for improvement in the rural areas under study are likely to be found in the transformation and marketing spheres and therefore more emphasis should be given to that sector covered in category IV.

### **Mesas de Concertación**

Important integration and participatory planning experiments are taking place in Cajamarca and Carchi. The "Mesa de Concertación" is a forum which has been used to bring municipal authorities, NGO representatives, university personnel and farmer associations into open discussion of problems and interests in their communities. Several mayors have responded to the idea of convening a space where interested parties can openly present, discuss and integrate ideas on development and problems within their municipal jurisdictions. This represents an exciting new way of democratizing and energizing local development in a bottom-up driven process. Development-minded individuals have in the "Mesa" a tool and mechanism to achieve agreement and to productively focus local resources.

The background to the methods used in this approach includes forty years of application in more than 30 different countries around the world. It was first introduced in Peru in 1980 and has been used with positive results in various environments since. It has proven to be adaptable to different populations and to enterprises of diverse characteristics and objectives. Above all, the approach facilitates a democratic process in situations where participative decision-making experience is lacking. It can be used at any level of the CONDESAN spectrum of interface fora, from community and regional levels to national and international planning and programming, and brings together a variety of actors representing disparate points of view and interests.

The Ecuador experience provides an interesting example. Meetings are convened at the community level between local associations and individuals to communicate with each other and define their needs. The outcome of these groups may be expressed at the municipal or mayoral level and integrated into the discussion process and planning at that level. A "Mesa" also exists at the national level for communication and consultation between the various national, regional, international, NGO and special interest association representatives convened by CONDESAN. The evaluators observed one of these meetings and were impressed by the open sharing of information on program activities and plans, problems and opportunities, and in several cases, identification of issues and information which would change at least some aspect of their activities or plans. The meeting created a space in which to share, collaborate and integrate a variety of separate initiatives funded from a wide range of sources both nationally and internationally. This horizontal communication can facilitate vertical communication between levels as well and articulate more fully the various needs and opportunities perceived.

Similar interaction has been promoted in other benchmark sites but with less focus on local development consensus. The key idea is to create a space and a process, a forum, for exchange of ideas and to focus effort and resources on joint initiatives. This approach is a key

element in the development process and should be promoted more fully. It follows in the path of an emerging world movement to decision-making and resource management at the municipal and local level bringing development closer to those it is meant to serve. CONDESAN is in a position to promote and evaluate this process and should consider providing training for moderators or process facilitators to work with groups in promoting functional, interactive planning processes. Interaction with the National Association of Municipalities in Ecuador is an excellent example of how CONDESAN is participating in and contributing to the experimentation and dissemination of this potentially powerful democratic development movement. The evaluation team feel that both the PPO and "Mesa de Concertación" experiences warrant emphasis.

One related but important theme the team did not consider for lack of data was that of transaction costs which can be considerable in participatory and interactive initiatives. These need to be kept clearly in mind and explicitly assessed in terms of benefits and costs on an ongoing basis. The role of INFOANDINA is extremely important in this context.

### **Infoandina**

Interaction between people is important for learning and for building on past experiences. When communication and interaction is facilitated across community, cultural, national, institutional and disciplinary boundaries learning is accelerated and application of scarce research resources can be made more efficient. With CONDESAN, CIP has established a regional information and communication exchange system called INFOANDINA. Its activities are to collect and disseminate research related information in the Andean region, enhance linkages among scientists and development agencies, encourage an efficient exchange of results through database sharing, electronic conferencing and electronic bulletin boards all in promotion of sustainable management of Andean natural resources.

CONDESAN has in INFOANDINA one of the most powerful tools for effective R&D management available. Up to this point, however, adequate resources have not been available to fully introduce and exploit the benefits that the use of electronic communication and conferencing between benchmark sites and partner representatives could bring. Many of the RTA researchers reported using E-mail and information exchange services but not always related to INFOANDINA. The service produces an electronic bulletin to disseminate general interest notes about CONDESAN activities and projects and distributes it to more than 200 institutions in the region.

Many partners of CONDESAN are aware of the benefits which could be derived from greater ease of communication through INFOANDINA but are reticent or know little about how to participate. Considerable creative work and experimentation is still required to introduce the use of these modern facilities, create spaces where people feel comfortable and motivated to interact, provide effective training and motivation and to demonstrate their powerful potential for efficient, regular and creative interchange of information and ideas.

### **Benchmark sites**

Much of the work of CONDESAN is related to field sites in Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador and Peru. These sites represent various agroecology environments found throughout the Andes with the expectation that documented results will allow extrapolation to homologous environments elsewhere in the region. This approach facilitates evaluation of alternative development initiatives and provides the base data for modelling of subsystems and their respective components. Research in these sites is linked to the participatory development activities of various members allowing documentation and assessment of introduced actions and technologies. Initiatives cover a wide range of activities in both social and biological sciences and in development. They involve different types of executing institutions such as NGOs, government agencies, universities, IARCs and others. There is also potential for private sector participation, especially in the areas of processing, market development and commercialisation of Andean agricultural products.

The benchmark site concept is a valid way of concentrating efforts in a few locations in order to juxtapose various research efforts and provide greater opportunity for integration of the contributions and perspectives of the different disciplines and programmes involved. In practice, it has been more difficult to achieve than to conceptualize in a coordinated way. There has been a pragmatic selection of areas based more on where various associates had contacts and involvement than on a careful assessment of the various environments for their representativeness. While this approach may not satisfy a methodological purist, it does represent an effective way of building on past experience, connections, databases and on-going initiatives. It also should lead to a better use of scarce resources as many of the start-up costs and activities are already taken care of.

There are notable differences in the way the various sites operate and in their integration into the overall CONDESAN initiative. A number of activities take place outside the main benchmark sites especially in the many projects of the biodiversity theme. For example, in Ecuador no work on Andean roots and tubers is being undertaken in the Carchi site because the indigenous population which generally cultivates these crops is not represented in the area. Only at the Puno site was the RTA work seen to be closely associated with other work being carried out under the CONDESAN banner.

The nature of the biodiversity theme activities makes it difficult to limit its area of work to the selected benchmark sites. In turn, this makes it difficult, and in some cases inappropriate, to create close integration with other CONDESAN R&D initiatives. Although this represents a discrepancy in an integrative and collaborative perspective at the site, it does not need to affect integration at the level of overall CONDESAN coordination. One response to this dilemma would be to define the various characteristics of major agroecological types as conceptual benchmark site models into which can be integrated data from research work at a variety of locations. Much of the data and the tools for doing this effectively are available and are being applied in one way or another at the operational sites and in the context of the modeling activities.

An example of this "virtual benchmark site" concept is being developed in Colombia where the chosen benchmark site at La Miel has not been developed to the same extent as the sites in the other countries. The approach uses simulation models with data from a number of case study project sites with varying characteristics and activities and integrates the data collected from each into a model for analysis and integration. In addition, this work is being linked closely with the modeling work at the Carchi site in Ecuador.

Another concept included in the benchmark site focus which merits mention is that of watersheds. In some of the sites such as Cajamarca and the new site proposed in Ecuador for the Cutuchi area the actions are taking place within actual watersheds and are related to the resource use and administrative units within their boundaries. In Puno and in Bolivia, the sites are contained within the larger watershed of the Lake Titicaca basin corresponding to the development unit boundaries of the Proyecto Especial para el Lago Titicaca (PELT), a binational development initiative between Peru and Bolivia. In Colombia, according to the CONDESAN representative, agricultural production and use of resources do not fit as easily into watershed boundaries and the idea is less useful as an organizing framework. It would be useful to better define the meaning, characteristics and application of these two concepts as mechanisms for systematizing and analysing information representative of a range of agroecological environments throughout the Andes. Methodology development for achieving this integration of information could be a useful part of the modelling activities.

### **Competitive grants**

The distribution of research funds to partner researchers has mainly used a competitive proposal process for selection of implementers. This has worked relatively well for the RTA theme but less satisfactorily for the allocation of funds to priority areas in the other theme areas. The main difference is that the biodiversity theme group used a two step process where initial quality screening of proposals was done by peer review followed by final selection by the programme technical committees on the basis of country and regional priorities as well as equitable distribution.

By way of contrast, the research funds available for the other theme areas were assigned on the basis of competitive proposals judged by a committee of external reviewers on quality only without reference to relevant priorities or to country site distribution. This has led to some sites receiving little or no money while in other areas research was supported which was not as closely related to core activities and focus as might have been desirable.

In general, this is an effective way to distribute funds amongst a variety of partners with research capabilities. The processes of announcing competitions, specifying requirements and priorities could be improved, however, to assure better integration of research undertaken and focus on key R&D areas and themes. In some cases it might be desirable to select a weaker proposal if it better addresses a key problem area for CONDESAN. Assistance in improving highly relevant proposals and research design could be provided by members of the technical committee, where appropriate, in the context of improving research capability

of weaker partner institutions. The process established in the biodiversity theme has been effective in this sense and could be applied in the selection of research proposals across the theme areas.

### **Modelling**

This is a key activity of CONDESAN and one in which CIP has a central role to play. There is already a high level team in place at CIP, and CIAT, capable of producing sophisticated and quality research output. This work is related to practical use in defining priorities and providing tools for decision-making at various levels. More could be said about the applicability and importance of this component of the CONDESAN work but suffice it to reiterate that the evaluation team recognizes this as an area of great importance in which CIP has a relative advantage to lead. The work related to the various sites could be better integrated, however, at least at the conceptual level, to provide a clear description of the work underway for purposes of explanation to other partners and to donors. As well, clear specification of modelling activities would provide clarification for monitoring purposes.

Despite the amount of work focused on modelling, ex-ante analysis has not figured as strongly in priority setting as might be expected. The concern felt by the team was that some areas of research activity were supply rather than demand led. That is, it was biased by technology interests or working situations already available. It is recommended that the principle of ex-ante analysis should be more widely used to arrive at strategic decisions.

## **7. CONSORTIUM STRUCTURE AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT**

The management of human, financial and infrastructure resources is an important task for CONDESAN members. For most partners, the generation of external support, as well as the utilization and management of these resources, has been principally considered a CIP function. Nevertheless, the local support of members at benchmark sites, including their research and development activities, has come mostly from their own resources and is quite significant when compared with the monetary investment from CONDESAN. This fact is itself an indication of the high level of member persuasion and commitment to common objectives. In Ecuador, it is estimated that the total member investment is four or five times more than the external resources coming through CONDESAN. In Cajamarca, several partners estimated that the investment of external CONDESAN funds is multiplied some ten times over by those provided from local members.

The evaluation team found that the information provided on funds generated and administered by CIP within the CONDESAN framework was difficult to assess. Apparently, a significant part of these funds is dedicated to expenditures for specific scientific personnel contracted by CIP or associated projects to support CONDESAN activities as in the case of IDRC support. Originally this was planned on the basis of

additional operational funds becoming available from other donors and this has not materialized up to the moment.

Decisions on the hiring of personnel and on research expenses have the appearance of being controlled by CIP and the actual situation has not been well explained. The evaluators recognize the great effort applied by CIP to generate these resources, however, their utilization requires a more open, transparent and democratic process which responds to a shared vision. This aspect represents a great opportunity to augment the cohesion and communication within the technical committee (including the members who are not located in Lima) and amongst partners.

Very effective mechanisms for resource administration were noted by the evaluation team at the operational level of RTA sub-project management. In Ecuador, for example, the persons responsible for specific activities have their own budget and bank account and the authorization to spend without consulting Lima. The evaluators feel this is an appropriate approach. The decentralization of authority in the use of resources to the lowest level possible can translate into efficiency and high levels of satisfaction.

The fixed costs of CONDESAN personnel in the headquarters at CIP in Lima are high when compared to the unrestricted funds which remain available for research and development at the benchmark sites. Those funds are indispensable to generate counterpart funds from other partners and to respond to new opportunities. The team acknowledges the desirability of a scientific critical mass in CIP headquarters and recognizes as well that the search for new resources must be intensified to augment the total capacity of the Consortium. However, if it is not possible to get new support in the short term, a recommended alternative is to reduce the number of scientists in Lima in order to augment field level flexibility. Admittedly, some donations are restricted to the contracting of specific personnel or for certain well-defined activities and are not available for use on general operational expenditures. Negotiating modifications to some agreements in order to achieve a better funding balance could be an alternative worth exploring.

A transparent separation, or at least a clear explanation of the sourcing of funds assigned to CONDESAN support is suggested. This is particularly true for those which may be derived from the Global Mountain Initiative, the Mountain Forum and the CIP Andean Natural Resources program. This would facilitate greatly the clarity of use of these funds and reduce the confusion which currently exists within CIP itself and amongst other partners.

In any event, the evaluators believe that the group of scientists specifically assigned to the CONDESAN projects could be located in a more efficient pattern. For example, the pilot sites in the altiplano of Peru and Bolivia are part of a whole, the Lake Titicaca basin or watershed. While there are ecological and production system differences, a comparative study over the whole area would be useful for developing methodologies able to identify activities with the highest benefit/cost ratio. For this reason, the evaluation team suggests that a member of



CONDESAN-CIP should be located in this region to facilitate coordination and carry out specific research projects.

In Cajamarca, a preponderance of development activities carried out principally by local CONDESAN partners was noted by the team. This is understandable in that most are NGOs which work closely with farmers and rural communities. However, there was a clear expression of interest in incorporating more research into the overall program. The evaluators suggest that this need for more research in Cajamarca merits the relocation of one of the scientists working in Lima to this benchmark site.

## **8. LOOKING TO THE FUTURE**

The concept of CONDESAN is rapidly being established as the way of the future for agricultural research to make an impact on reducing poverty while conserving and sustaining natural resources. CONDESAN is a further evolution of the research networks concept and is integrating both research and development in a holistic approach. It is the space in which all partners can contribute their respective expertise to the common aim as well as themselves benefiting from the contribution of others. It is especially noteworthy that some partners are bringing specialist expertise to the consortium which would not normally be available. Examples of this are the use of satellite monitoring for detection of specific problems like salinity or the development of production modelling such as is taking place in many pilot sites. This is creating a synergy which was lacking in traditional networks.

It is also encouraging to see the involvement of several international research organisations and through the Global Mountain Initiative and the Mountain Forum, international organisations based on other continents.

The current operational funding of CONDESAN is being multiplied many times by the local contributions of partners some of whom are seeking additional project funding based on the strength of their CONDESAN involvement. This combination of funding sources facilitates more effective and efficient use of both internal and external resources. The evaluation team sees this as a very positive step and welcomes further initiatives of this nature as it will assist the process of decentralization and leverage the impact of all the resources invested. A weakness of the present system is that too much funding is restricted to specific component parts leaving little room for flexibility to respond to new opportunities such as may be identified through *ex-ante* analysis and consultation with local community representatives. The team would therefore encourage some donors to provide longer term, more open, support to CONDESAN to increase its flexibility and stability.

The research funds allocated through the competition process are very valuable seed money to initiate projects. Nevertheless, only nine projects have been funded so far, aside from the biodiversity related RTA projects. It is hoped that more CONDESAN funding can be released or new funds sought for this very valuable strategy.

The CONDESAN mission is a long-term undertaking. Neither poverty nor the erosion of natural resources will be alleviated within the present time span of CONDESAN funding (five years). Although there are already some significant improvements on a small-scale in terms of soil and water conservation and management of genetic resources, experience of other projects has shown that the time scale for a measurable impact is at least ten years or more. This should be borne in mind by CONDESAN members and donors alike. The PPO documents will also need to be periodically updated to be of value in guiding and monitoring progress in CONDESAN projects.

One can also visualize that CONDESAN will become more decentralised with several theme coordinators creating information flows across the Andean region. When INFOANDINA gains momentum, it will be the unifying force for scientific, development and policy exchange which can give even the weakest partner access to the current thinking of his partners within the national and international spectrum. This will permit all project activities to benefit from experimental results of other partners using the latest techniques and methodology.

The more successful that CONDESAN activities become, the more a common sense of ownership will develop among the partners. It is extremely important that this sense continues to develop as it will encourage a continuity for the movement which has been lacking in traditional networks. Involving many partners, particularly the inclusion of farmers and municipal authorities at the local level, should ensure that the development activities are sustainable as everyone has a personal interest in the outcome. It also ensures that the research being conducted is relevant to practical situations and not entirely academic. However, there will always be a role for more formal research which can focus on fundamental aspects of problems and then provide input into simulations and practical solutions.

CONDESAN also provides a space for the private sector to participate. It has been pointed out that market research and identification of value added opportunities for enhanced production involves ex-ante analysis. This is an area where the private sector is especially competent. Successful examples of this nature were seen in Ecuador (marketing quinoa) and in Cajamarca for milk production.

CONDESAN can play a key role in training the next generation of scientists and extensionists. The combination of scientific and development expertise which is being

developed at the benchmark sites offers an excellent training ground. Some partners are already involved in supervising the research of students and CONDESAN should consider providing a competitive fund for student projects.

Predictions about the effect CONDESAN will have on agricultural policy and programs are still premature. However, it is safe to say that what is taking place at the local level in the watershed benchmark areas and in the altiplano of Bolivia and Peru can have repercussions on a far wider scale as, through CONDESAN connections, results are extrapolated to other areas in the Andes and to highland situations world-wide.

In all the regions and institutions visited, the evaluation team found ample interest and readiness of partners to participate but this was often mixed with some uncertainty about the actual procedures and mechanisms to follow. The challenge for CONDESAN Co-ordination at all levels is to promote the realization that this is not just another externally funded network. It is a concept built on combining existing experience and resources to work more effectively. Those we met who have grasped this concept are committed and enthusiastically supportive of continuing the experiment.

The team was very conscious that CONDESAN is not an organization or network in the traditional sense and this makes it more difficult to explain and to attribute accomplishments. It has been constructed on the basis of a number of existing projects involving both research and development efforts and the resources available to the coordinating unit as specific CONDESAN funding are only a small proportion of the total amount being invested in related activities. Even these funds are allocated to specific components of the overall plan set out in the PPO plans. The challenge for the future is in learning how to work in this kind of relationship through better communication, focus and a greater willingness to "compartir recursos y beneficios".

CONDESAN has been well established and should continue. Its concepts and mechanisms are solid and are quickly evolving with the experience of experimentation. As the designated convening partner, CIP provides scientific and conceptual strength, administrative support and infrastructure for greatly increased communication and information sharing through INFOANDINA. The benchmark sites provide work areas for combining practical applied development experience with research methods and output testing. The PPO process, modelling capabilities and ex-ante analysis provide for better identification of real problems and opportunities and allow for effective extrapolation to other untested locations. The "mesas de concertación" promote policy and local administration dialogue in a democratic context. Donors have a structure with potential to facilitate more effective and synergistic use of their support. And, at this point in the evolution of the consortium, it is very important to have a strong and versatile convening partner. For this role, CIP is the natural choice. In undertaking this challenge, it will need to promote leadership without overly dominating the other members and experiment with new ways for managing non-line responsibility relationships.

The evaluation team is convinced that CONDESAN should continue and that the weaknesses pointed out in this report, and the recommendations, can be turned into strengths and opportunities to be added to the considerable accomplishments already realized by the CONDESAN partners.

APPENDIX I

**ITINERARY OF THE CONDESAN EXTERNAL  
EVALUATION TEAM**

# **ITINERARY OF THE CONDESAN EXTERNAL EVALUATION TEAM**

(May 20 to June 12, 1996)

May 20, Monday	Arrival of the evaluation team in Quito.
May 21, Tuesday	Review of documents, meetings with representatives of the Technical Committee and the Director of FUNDAGRO.
May 22, Wednesday	Meeting at the Ecuadorean Association of Municipalities (AME), interviews with members of the Technical Committee, presentations of partners and individual interviews.
May 23, Thursday	Interviews with the CONDESAN coordinator for Ecuador, the Director of FLACSO, Ecuador Office and with Dr. Jaime Tola, D.G. of INIAP and Chair of the CONDESAN Board. Travel to Carchi.
May 24, Friday	Field visits in the Carchi area, El Angel District. Return to Quito.
May 25, Saturday	Interview with members of the biodiversity group in Ecuador. Travel Quito - Lima.
May 26, Sunday	Lima - prepare initial outline for report.
May 27, Monday	Meeting with Dr. Luis Paz Silva, member of the CONDESAN Board of Directors and Jose Valle-Riestra, Deputy D.G. of CIP. Plenary meeting with the Technical Committee in CIP. Interviews with technical and administration staff, CIP.
May 28, Tuesday	Lima - Cajamarca. Meetings with technical staff of ASPADERUC and local representatives of CONDESAN members.
May 29, Wednesday	Field visits in the districts of La Encañada, Matara and Namora
May 30, Thursday	Visit ADEFOR and return to Lima. Meeting with Dr. H. Zandstra, D.G. and Dr. J. Valle-Riestra, Deputy D.G. of CIP. Meeting with members of CONDESAN-Peru, institutional activity presentations.
May 31, Friday	Interview with Dr. Luis Paz Silva. Individual meetings.

June 1, Saturday	Lima - Puno: E. Weber/N. Mateo Lima - La Paz: L. Brown
June 2, Sunday	Puno: Field visit to Yunguyu and Community Sta. Maria (Ilave) La Paz: Individual meetings.
June 3, Monday	Puno: Meeting with CONDESAN-Puno site project leaders. Interviews with directors of PELT, CAME and the Universidad Nacional del Altiplano. La Paz: Meeting with members of CONDESAN-Bolivia and visit to the ABTEMA installations.
June 4, Tuesday	Puno: Visit INIA, Exp. Station Illpa and return to Lima. La Paz: Field visit to Patacamaya, Orkopiña, Pumani and Santiago de Collana.
June 5, Wednesday	La Paz - Lima: K. Brown. Lima: Report writing, E. Weber/N. Mateo.
June 6, Thursday	Final report preparation. Meeting with Dr. H. Zandstra.
June 7, Friday	Meeting with Dr. Carlos Quiros and Dr. Jan Stiefel, biodiversity theme evaluators. Final report preparation. Presentation of findings to Dr. Zandstra, L. Paz Silva, J. Valle-Riestra, H. Li Pun and the biodiversity theme evaluators. Presentation of findings to the Technical Committee.
June 8, Saturday	Departure of Dr. Mateo. K. Brown/E. Weber continue with report preparation.
June 9, Sunday	Report writing. Meeting with Dr. Jurg Benz of COSUDE.
June 10 and 11	Report preparation by E. Weber/K. Brown.
June 12, Wednesday	Departure of E. Weber.

## APPENDIX II

### **PEOPLE MET AND MEETING PARTICIPANTS**



## ECUADOR

May 21 to 25, 1996

### List of meeting participants and persons consulted individually

NAME	INSTITUTION
Patricia Casare	CARE - PROMUSTA
Patricio Tinajero	CARE - PROMUSTA
Osvaldo Paladines	CONDESAN, Coordinator for Ecuador
Elias Mujica	CONDESAN-CIP, Lima
Ruben Dario Estrada	CONDESAN-CIAT, Coordinator for Colombia
Charlie Crisman	CIP-CONDESAN Ecuador, CIP country leader
Daniele Salvini	FAO
Jorge Recharte	FLACSO
Susan Poats	FLACSO
Fernando Carrión M.	FLACSO, Director of Ecuador Branch
Jorge F. Chang G.	FUNDAGRO, Executive Director
Bolivar Navas	FUNDAGRO
Jaime Tola	INIAP, Director and Chair of CONDESAN Board
Juan Cordova	INIAP
Patricio Espinoza	CIP- Biodiversity project, RTA, Ecuador
Raul Cañas	INIAP - Leader, Phytogenetics y Biotechnology
Jorge Sotomayor	IIMI
Fabian Castillo	CONDESAN - Carchi
Blanca Arce	CONDESAN - Carchi
Marcelo Buendia	AME, Technical Director
Fernando Gallegos	AME, Planning
AME	Asociación de Municipalidades Ecuatorianas
CARE	CARE Internacional, Project PROMUSTA, Ecuador
CIAT	Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FLACSO	Facultad Latino Americana de Ciencias Sociales
FUNDAGRO	Fundación para el Desarrollo Agropecuario, Ecuador
INIAP	Instituto Nacional Autónomo de Investigaciones Agropecuarias
IIMI	International Institute for the Management of Irrigation

## CAJAMARCA BENCHMARK SITE, PERU

( May 28 to 30, 1996)

### List of meeting participants and persons consulted individually

NAME	INSTITUTION
Mario Tapia	CONDESAN - ASPADERUC
Abel Díaz Berrios	Municipality of Cajamarca
Gilmer Muñoz	ASPADERUC
Pablo Sánchez Z.,	ASPADERUC, President
Eduardo Cabrera Urteaga	Municipality of Namora
Julio Velásquez Camacho	INIA - Exp. Station, Baños del Inca
Edevaly de la Peña	ASODEL
Alcides Rosas Uribe	ASPADERUC
Enrique Salazar Sánchez	Municipality of La Encañada
Juan Horna Alvarado	ADEFOR
Homero Aliaga Zamón	Minag, Cajamarca Agricultural Sub-Region
Oscar Santisteban K.	CIPDER, Executive Secretary
Marcela Rabanal Pajares	IINCAP "Jorge Basadre"
Isidoro Sánchez Vega	Univ. Nac. de Cajamarca, Postgraduate
School	
Ana María Ponce	CIP-CONDESAN-INFOANDINA
Mario Cáceres M.	ASPADERUC
Emilio Cacho Gayoso	INCA-RENOM project
Juán Mejía Alarcon	ASPADERUC
Luis Chuquiruna Ortiz	ASPADERUC
ASPADERUC	Asociación para el Desarrollo Rural de Cajamarca.
ADEFOR	Asociación Civil para la Investigación y Desarrollo Forestal.
CIPDER	Consorcio Interinstitucional de Desarrollo.
UNC	Universidad Nacional de Cajamarca.
IINCAP	Instituto de Investigación y Capacitación "Jorge Basadre"
INIA	Instituto Nacional de Investigación Agraria.

## LIMA, PERÚ

(May 30, 1996)

### Participant list of meeting with CONDESAN partners

NAME	INSTITUTION
Carlos Salazar	DESCO
Carolina Triveli	IEP
David Talledo G.	Univ. Ricardo Palma, Fac. of Biological Sciences
Elías Mujica	CONDESAN
Ena Mejía R.	IIN
Faustino Cioma	IAPA - RIA 06-004
Francisco Salas	Universidad Nacional Agraria
Gonzalo Pajares	CIED
Hilary Creed-Kanashiro	IIN
José Canziani Amico	INDEA
José Luis Rueda	CONDESAN
Juan Sánchez B.	CIED
Molina Zeballos	DESCO
Rolado Egúsqiza	Universidad Nacional Agraria
Sven Villagarcía	Universidad Nacional Agraria, Sulphur Project in cultivated soils of the high Andes

CIED	Centro de Investigación de Educación y Desarrollo.
DESCO	Centro de Estudios y Promoción del Desarrollo.
IAPA	Instituto de Análisis de Política Agraria.
IEP	Instituto de Estudios Peruanos
IIN	Instituto de Investigación Nutricional.
INDEA	Instituto Andino de Estudios Arqueológicos.

## **CENTRO INTERNACIONAL DE LA PAPA (CIP)**

### **List of persons consulted**

<b>NAME</b>	<b>RESPONSIBILITY</b>
Hubert Zandstra	CIP, Director General
Jose Valle-Riestra	CIP, Dpty. Director General
Luis Paz Silva	Member of the CONDESAN Board of Directors
Carlos Niño	CIP, Controller
Roger Cortbaoui	CIP, Director of International Programs
Fernando Ezeta	CIP, Regional Representative for Latin America
Gregory Scott	CIP, Leader, Postharvest and Commercialization Program

### **CONDESAN Technical Team Members**

Jose Luis Rueda	CIP Coordinator, Andean Natural Resources Program
Miguel Holle	Biodiversity of Andean Crops
Carlos Leon Velarde	Animal Production Systems, Puno benchmark site
Roberto Quiróz	Land and Water Management, Bolivian Altiplano
Mario Tapia	Agroecologist, Cajamarca benchmark site
Walter Bowen	Nutrient Cycling Specialist
Elias Mujica	Anthropologist, Rural Development and policies
Tom Walker	CIP, Program I Leader, Production Systems
Patricio Malagamba	CIP, Human Resource Development
Robert Hjimans	CIP, Associate Expert

### **Biodiversity Theme Evaluators**

Carlos Quiros	University of California, Davis
Jan H. Stiefel	Independent Consultant

### **Donor Representatives**

Jurg Benz	Swiss Technical Cooperation (SDC)
Hugo Li Pun	International Development Research Centre (IDRC)

## PUNO BENCHMARK SITE, PERÚ

(June 1 to 4, 1996)

### List of meeting participants and individuals consulted

NAME	INSTITUTION
Carlos León Velarde	CONDESAN - CIRNMA
Jorge Reinoso	CONDESAN - CIRNMA
Roberto Valdivia	CONDESAN - CIRNMA
Mario Lino Gonzáles	CONDESAN - CIRNMA
Lucas Colque	CONDESAN - CIRNMA
Vicente Choquehuanca	CONDESAN - CIRNMA
Rolando Ponce	PISA - PRODASA - CONDESAN
Saturnino Marca	PISA - PRODASA - CONDESAN
Ricardo Claverías	CAME and PISA - PRODASA
Ariel Bermejo	PELT, Director
Juan Palao	CAME, Director
Edmundo Vilca	INIA, Director Illpa Experimental Station
Fernando Cáceda	UNAP, Academic Director
Hipólito Pari	UNAP, Post Graduate Director
Dichi Flores	PELT, Processing Engineer
Alfonso Llanos	Regional Government
Luis Rodríguez	Regional Government

  

CAME	Consejo Andino de Manejo Ecologico
CIRNMA	Centro de Investigación de Recursos Naturales y Medio Ambiente.
INIA	Instituto Nacional de Investigación Agraria
PELT	Proyecto Especial Binacional Lago Titicaca
PISA	Proyecto de Investigación de Sistemas Agropecuarios Andinos.
PRODASA	Proyecto de Desarrollo Agropecuario Sostenido en el Altiplano.

## **BOLIVIA**

(June 1 to 4, 1996)

### **List of meeting participants and persons consulted**

<b>NAME</b>	<b>INSTITUTION</b>
Julio Rea	RTA 1-020
Dominique Herve	ORSTOM
Roberto Quiroz	CONDESAN - CIP
David Morales	IBTA
R. Ledezma	YUNTA
Guillermo Calderón	Ecología Andina
Ma. Eugenia Jiménez	Ecología Andina
Freddy Flores	Ecología Andina
Mario Arrieta	ILDIS
José Luis Rueda	CONDESAN - CIP
G. Alfaro	UMSS
F. Terrazas	PROINPA
José Blanes	CEBEM
Hipólito Quispe	IBTA - CIID
Luis Miranda F.	UMSA, Faculty of Agronomy
Victor Mita	IBTA - CONDESAN
Sofia Moreau	ABTEMA
Isabel Aerayo	ILDIS

ABTEMA	Asociación Boliviana de Teledetección para el medio ambiente.
CEBEM	Centro Boliviano de Estudios Multidisciplinarios.
IBTA	Instituto Boliviano de Tecnología Agropecuaria.
ILDIS	Instituto Latinoamericano de Investigaciones Sociales.
ORSTOM	French Institute of Scientific Research for Development and Cooperation
PROINPA	Programa de Investigación de la Papa.
UMSS	Universidad Mayor de San Simón.
UMSA	Universidad Mayor de San Andrés.

## APPENDIX III

### FIGURES

blank for diagrammes



## APPENDIX IV

### **ACRONYMS**

## ACRONYMS

ABTEMA	Asociación Boliviano de Teledetección para el Medio Ambiente
ADEFOR	Asociación Civil para la Investigación y Desarrollo Forestal
ADEX	Asociación de Exportadores del Perú
AME	Asociación de Municipalidades Ecuatorianas
ASPADERUC	Asociación para el Desarrollo Rural de Cajamarca
CAME	Consejo andino de Manejo Ecológico
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CIP	Centro Internacional de la Papa
CIRNMA	Centro de Investigación de Recursos Naturales y Medio Ambiente
CONDESAN	Consortium for the Sustainable Development of the Andean
Ecoregion	
FDN	Fundación para el Desarrollo Agropecuario
FLACSO	Facultad Latino Americana de Ciencias Sociales
FUNDAGRO	Fundación para el Desarrollo Agropecuario
IDRC	International Development Research Centre
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
INIAP	Instituto Nacional Autonomo de Investigaciones Agropecuarias
ILEIA	Information Center for Low Input and Sustainable Agriculture
PELT	Proyecto Especial Binacional del Lago Titicaca
PISA	Proyecto de Investigación de Sistemas Agropecuarios Andinos
PPO	Participatory Project Planning by Objectives
PRODASA	Proyecto de Desarrollo Agropecuario Sostenido en el Altiplano
RTA	Raíces y Tuberosas Andinas
SDC	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation